



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/178,840	10/26/1998	ANGELIKI OSTE TRIANTAFYLLOU	P/2432-19	5038

24998 7590 11/07/2002

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP
2101 L STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-1526

EXAMINER

SHERMER, CURTIS EDWARD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1761	33

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/178,840	Applicant(s) Triantafyllou
	Examiner Curtis E. Sherrer	Art Unit 1761

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Curtis E. Sherrer

(3) _____

(2) Peter McGee

(4) _____

Date of Interview Oct 25, 2002

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: _____

Identification of prior art discussed:

The Report of Brewing Industry Research Foundation, Scott (Jnl. of the Inst. of Brewing), Kong, and Lindal.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants will consider amending claim 1 to provide antecedent basis for the rejected phrase. Will consider modifying the language of claim 6 to further define claim 1 or removing the claim. With regard to the 102 rejection, applicants will consider further amending the claim to further define the invention over the cited art. Specifically, applicants may claim that no germinated grains are used, further define the heating step or possibly, limiting the process as to when the heating step occurs. With regard to the 103 rejection, applicants may submit evidence to show that the product of the Lindahl reference would not produce the product of the claims. Applicants may also present arguments that the prior art is not combinable. The examiner stated that the possible amendments would, most likely, not be entered after the pending final rejection.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

CURTIS E. SHERMER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1761



Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.